

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12-14 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,905,295 to Prall et al.

The office action states that "Prall, et al., (Figures 1A-B) teach *a fuse bank* of a semiconductor memory device comprising..." and continues on to use fuses 103 and 103' as the examples. However, fuses 103 and 103' are in different fuse banks. Figure 1A of Prall shows the fuses of one fuse bank, Figure 1B, which shows fuse 103', shows two different fuse banks.

See Prall, col. 3, lines 65-66, "Shown is a *fuse set comprised of three fuses*, hereinafter the left fuse 101, the central fuse 102 and the right fuse 103." Further, at col. 4, lines 11-12, "A fuse set is created by placing a left fuse, a central fuse and a right fuse..." In col. 4, lines 19-22, Prall states, "FIG. 1B shows how each succeeding *fuse set* is rotated 180°..." Therefore, fuses 103 and 103' are not in the same fuse set, which is analogous to the same fuse bank of the instant application.

Having established that the comparison to the claim language using fuses 103 and 103' does not apply, one must now apply the language to the fuses within one fuse set comprised of fuses 101, 102 or 103 of the Prall disclosure. For example, claim 1 requires that a first fuse on the bank have structures in three directions. As defined in Applicant's specification, for illustrative purposes only, Figure 3 shows the first direction as being horizontal across the page from left to right (311), the second direction as being vertical from the middle of the page going towards the top of the page (310), and the third direction as being vertical from the middle of the page going downwards (313). The second laser fuse in the same bank uses the same directions.

Using the same analysis on FIG. 1A of Prall, fuse 103 has a horizontal section in a first direction from left to right (the horizontal section from the bottom of 103a to the top of 103b), a vertical section in the second direction from the middle of the page going upwards towards the top (103a), and a vertical section in the third direction from the middle of the page going towards the bottom (103b). As fuse 102 has not bends, we turn to fuse 101 to compare. Fuse 101 has a vertical section in the second direction from the middle of the page going upwards (101a), a vertical section in the third direction from the middle of the page going downward (101b), but the horizontal section between sections 101a and 101b is in a fourth direction, horizontal from the middle of the page going to the left, not the first direction. Under 35 USC 102, the prior must teach every feature of the claimed invention.

Docket No. 9898-291 Page 6 of 8 Application No. 10/620,015

As amended, the independent claims require that the fuses *within a fuse group* (bank) have portions in one of three directions, none of them use fourth direction and all of them use the same three directions. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to include that the second laser fuse and the first laser fuse be disposed adjacently in the fuse bank (referring back to the preamble of the claim for antecedent basis). Claims 5 and 10 has been amended to require that 'each laser fuse in each laser fuse group each include a laser fusing region which is disposed in the first direction.' Prior to amendment, claims 15 and 18 required that "a first fuse region and a second fuse region be arranged parallel to each other," which is not shown by Prall. To further clarify, claims 15 and 18 have been amended to also require that the laser regions be parallel to each other in the same direction."

It is therefore submitted that claims 1, 5, 10, 15 and 18 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 3-4 depend from claim 1 and inherently contain all of the limitations of that claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 3-4 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 7-9 depend from claim 1 and inherently contain all of the limitations of that claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 7-9 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 12-14 depend from claim 1 and inherently contain all of the limitations of that claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 12-14 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 16-17 depend from claim 1 and inherently contain all of the limitations of that claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 16-17 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 19-20 depend from claim 1 and inherently contain all of the limitations of that claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 19-20 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

is therefore submitted that claims 19-20 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 2, 6 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,905,295 to Prall et al.

The office action states that the 'modification would have involved a mere change in the shape of a component... a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found [it] obvious absent persuasive evidence that the particular configuration of the claimed container was significant.'

For the reasons as applied above to claims 1, 5 and 10, from which these claims respectively depend, it is submitted that these claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested. Further, the change of the shape of the fusing region allows more fuses to be fit into much smaller spaces than those of the convention art, including that of Prall. Persuasive evidence has been provided in Applicants' specification and drawings, specifically Figure 5 and the accompanying discussion. Therefore, altering the shape of the fusing region is significant as it has a large impact on the change in the size of the fusing region. Allowance of these claims is requested.

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-20 of the application as amended is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,
MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed

Julie L. Reed, Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205
503-222-3613

I hereby certify that this correspondence
is being transmitted to the U.S. Patent and
Trademark Office via facsimile number
703-872-9306, on March 10, 2005.

Li Mei Vermilya
Li Mei Vermilya